

05/01/2003

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2001/2002**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 1 of 8**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>TOTALS</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
<b>ALAMEDA COUNTY</b>												
ALAMEDA CITY CIC						4	106	110	17	7	17	7
FREMONT RDA						41	3	44	7	3	7	3
SAN LEANDRO RDA						44		44	7	3	7	3
County Totals:						<b>89</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>BUTTE COUNTY</b>												
CHICO RDA							30	30	5	2	5	2
County Totals:							<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY</b>												
BRENTWOOD RDA						74		74	11	4	11	4
CONCORD RDA						7		7	1	0	1	0
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY RDA						63		63	9	4	9	4
OAKLEY	80		80	24	12						24	12
PINOLE RDA						3		3	0	0	0	0
PITTSBURG RDA						1,021		1,021	153	61	153	61
PLEASANT HILL RDA	1		1	0	0						0	0
County Totals:	<b>81</b>		<b>81</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1,168</b>		<b>1,168</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>FRESNO COUNTY</b>												
CLOVIS CDA	12		12	4	2						4	2
FRESNO CITY RDA	64		64	19	10						19	10
County Totals:	<b>76</b>		<b>76</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>						<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>HUMBOLDT COUNTY</b>												
EUREKA RDA		8	8	2	1	20	52	72	11	4	13	6
County Totals:		<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>KERN COUNTY</b>												

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2003

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2001/2002**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 2 of 8**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	<b>1. New</b>	<b>2. Sub.</b>	<b>3. Sum</b>	<b>4. Incl Ob</b>	<b>5. Very-Low</b>	<b>6. New</b>	<b>7. Sub.</b>	<b>8. Sum</b>	<b>9. Incl Ob.</b>	<b>10. VLow</b>	<b>11. Sum</b>	<b>12. VLow</b>
	<b>Units</b>	<b>Rehab</b>	<b>#1+#2</b>	<b>#3 x 30%</b>	<b>#4 x 50%</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Rehab.</b>	<b>#6+#7</b>	<b>#8 x 15%</b>	<b>#9x 40%</b>	<b>#4+#9*</b>	<b>#5+#10</b>
<b>BAKERSFIELD RDA</b>						4	4	8	1	0	1	0
<b>CALIFORNIA CITY RDA</b>						7		7	1	0	1	0
<b>DELANO RDA</b>						107	7	114	17	7	17	7
<b>RIDGECREST RDA</b>						49		49	7	3	7	3
<b>SHAFTER RDA</b>						32	32	64	10	4	10	4
<b>WASCO RDA</b>							2	2	0	0	0	0
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>199</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>LOS ANGELES COUNTY</b>												
<b>AZUSA RDA</b>						48		48	7	3	7	3
<b>CERRITOS RDA</b>						93		93	14	6	14	6
<b>CULVER CITY RDA</b>						9		9	1	1	1	1
<b>EL MONTE COMMUNITY RDA</b>						17		17	3	1	3	1
<b>GLEN DORA RDA</b>	358		358	107	54						107	54
<b>LANCASTER RDA</b>	4		4	1	1	703		703	105	42	107	43
<b>LOS ANGELES CITY CRA</b>	129		129	39	19						39	19
<b>NORWALK RDA</b>	236		236	71	35	236		236	35	14	106	50
<b>PICO RIVERA RDA</b>						31		31	5	2	5	2
<b>POMONA RDA</b>						4	19	23	3	1	3	1
<b>SANTA CLARITA RDA</b>						2		2	0	0	0	0
<b>SANTA MONICA RDA</b>						639	37	676	101	41	101	41
<b>WEST HOLLYWOOD RDA</b>						20		20	3	1	3	1
<b>WHITTIER RDA</b>	6		6	2	1						2	1
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>733</b>		<b>733</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>1,802</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>1,858</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>499</b>	<b>221</b>

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2003

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2001/2002**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 3 of 8**

	PART I					PART II					PART III	
	[H&SC Section 33413(b)(1)]					[H&SC Section 33413(b)(2)]					[TOTALS]	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
MARIN COUNTY												
SAN RAFAEL RDA							51	51	8	3	8	3
TIBURON RDA						4		4	1	0	1	0
County Totals:						4	51	55	8	3	8	3
MERCED COUNTY												
ATWATER RDA						63	6	69	10	4	10	4
MERCED CITY RDA		6	6	2	1						2	1
County Totals:		6	6	2	1	63	6	69	10	4	12	5
MONTEREY COUNTY												
MONTEREY COUNTY CDA						26	6	32	5	2	5	2
SALINAS RDA	5	3	8	2	1						2	1
SOLEDAD RDA						14		14	2	1	2	1
County Totals:	5	3	8	2	1	40	6	46	7	3	9	4
NEVADA COUNTY												
GRASS VALLEY RDA												
County Totals:												
ORANGE COUNTY												
ANAHEIM RDA	6		6	2	1	88		88	13	5	15	6
BUENA PARK RDA	86		86	26	13	53		53	8	3	34	16
HUNTINGTON BEACH RDA							5	5	1	0	1	0
LA PALMA CDC	60		60	18	9						18	9
SAN CLEMENTE RDA						25		25	4	2	4	2
SANTA ANA CRA						5		5	1	0	1	0
STANTON RDA						28		28	4	2	4	2

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2003

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2001/2002**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 4 of 8**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>TOTALS</b>	
	<b>1. New Units</b>	<b>2. Sub. Rehab</b>	<b>3. Sum #1+#2</b>	<b>4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%</b>	<b>5. Very-Low #4 x 50%</b>	<b>6. New Units</b>	<b>7. Sub. Rehab.</b>	<b>8. Sum #6+#7</b>	<b>9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%</b>	<b>10. VLow #9x 40%</b>	<b>11. Sum #4+#9*</b>	<b>12. VLow #5+#10</b>
<b>WESTMINSTER RDA</b>						170		170	26	10	26	10
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>152</b>		<b>152</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>PLACER COUNTY</b>												
<b>PLACER COUNTY RDA</b>		2	2	1	0	11		11	2	1	2	1
<b>County Totals:</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>RIVERSIDE COUNTY</b>												
<b>COACHELLA RDA</b>						477		477	72	29	72	29
<b>CORONA RDA</b>							2	2	0	0	0	0
<b>DESERT HOT SPRINGS RDA</b>						98		98	15	6	15	6
<b>INDIAN WELLS RDA</b>						90		90	14	5	14	5
<b>INDIO RDA</b>	11		11	3	2						3	2
<b>LA QUINTA RDA</b>		21	21	6	3	951	4	955	143	57	150	60
<b>PALM DESERT RDA</b>						457		457	69	27	69	27
<b>RANCHO MIRAGE RDA</b>												
<b>RIVERSIDE COUNTY RDA</b>		1	1	0	0						0	0
<b>RIVERSIDE RDA</b>						83	3	86	13	5	13	5
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2,156</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2,165</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>SACRAMENTO COUNTY</b>												
<b>SACRAMENTO CITY AND COUNTY RDA</b>						47	15	62	9	4	9	4
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>47</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SAN BENITO COUNTY</b>												
<b>HOLLISTER RDA</b>						58		58	9	3	9	3
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>58</b>		<b>58</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY</b>												
<b>CHINO RDA</b>						11		11	2	1	2	1

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2003

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2001/2002**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 5 of 8**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	<b>1. New</b>	<b>2. Sub.</b>	<b>3. Sum</b>	<b>4. Incl Ob</b>	<b>5. Very-Low</b>	<b>6. New</b>	<b>7. Sub.</b>	<b>8. Sum</b>	<b>9. Incl Ob.</b>	<b>10. VLow</b>	<b>11. Sum</b>	<b>12. VLow</b>
	<b>Units</b>	<b>Rehab</b>	<b>#1+#2</b>	<b>#3 x 30%</b>	<b>#4 x 50%</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Rehab.</b>	<b>#6+#7</b>	<b>#8 x 15%</b>	<b>#9x 40%</b>	<b>#4+#9*</b>	<b>#5+#10</b>
COLTON RDA	1	8	9	3	1						3	1
FONTANA RDA	115	39	154	46	23						46	23
GRAND TERRACE RDA							2	2	0	0	0	0
HIGHLAND RDA						242		242	36	15	36	15
LOMA LINDA RDA						32		32	5	2	5	2
SAN BERNARDINO RDA						173		173	26	10	26	10
VICTORVILLE RDA						179		179	27	11	27	11
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>SAN DIEGO COUNTY</b>												
CORONADO CRA						27		27	4	2	4	2
ESCONDIDO CDC						23		23	3	1	3	1
NATIONAL CITY CDC							384	384	58	23	58	23
SAN DIEGO CITY RDA						901		901	135	54	135	54
SAN MARCOS RDA						516	23	539	81	32	81	32
VISTA RDA						17		17	3	1	3	1
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>1,484</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>1,891</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>San Francisco COUNTY</b>												
S.F. CITY & COUNTY RDA						488		488	73	29	73	29
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>488</b>		<b>488</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY</b>												
STOCKTON RDA						50		50	8	3	8	3
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>50</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SAN MATEO COUNTY</b>												
EAST PALO ALTO RDA						300		300	45	18	45	18

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2003

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2001/2002**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 6 of 8**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>TOTALS</b>	
	<b>1. New</b>	<b>2. Sub.</b>	<b>3. Sum</b>	<b>4. Incl Ob</b>	<b>5. Very-Low</b>	<b>6. New</b>	<b>7. Sub.</b>	<b>8. Sum</b>	<b>9. Incl Ob.</b>	<b>10. VLow</b>	<b>11. Sum</b>	<b>12. VLow</b>
	<b>Units</b>	<b>Rehab</b>	<b>#1+#2</b>	<b>#3 x 30%</b>	<b>#4 x 50%</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Rehab.</b>	<b>#6+#7</b>	<b>#8 x 15%</b>	<b>#9x 40%</b>	<b>#4+#9*</b>	<b>#5+#10</b>
<b>REDWOOD CITY RDA</b>						31		31	5	2	5	2
<b>SAN CARLOS RDA</b>						2		2	0	0	0	0
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>333</b>		<b>333</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>SANTA BARBARA COUNTY</b>												
<b>SANTA BARBARA RDA</b>							28	28	4	2	4	2
<b>County Totals:</b>							<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>SANTA CLARA COUNTY</b>												
<b>CAMPBELL RDA</b>	4		4	1	1	16		16	2	1	4	2
<b>MILPITAS RDA</b>						68		68	10	4	10	4
<b>MORGAN HILL RDA</b>						11		11	2	1	2	1
<b>SAN JOSE RDA</b>						1,138		1,138	171	68	171	68
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1,233</b>		<b>1,233</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>SANTA CRUZ COUNTY</b>												
<b>SANTA CRUZ CITY RDA</b>						122	13	135	20	8	20	8
<b>SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RDA</b>						5		5	1	0	1	0
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>127</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>SHASTA COUNTY</b>												
<b>REDDING RDA</b>	19		19	6	3						6	3
<b>SHASTA LAKE</b>	50		50	15	8						15	8
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>69</b>		<b>69</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>10</b>						<b>21</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>SOLANO COUNTY</b>												
<b>VACAVILLE RDA</b>						480		480	72	29	72	29
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>480</b>		<b>480</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>SONOMA COUNTY</b>												
<b>HEALDSBURG RDA</b>		4	4	1	1	6		6	1	0	2	1

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2003

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2001/2002**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 7 of 8**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>TOTALS</b>	
	<b>1. New</b>	<b>2. Sub.</b>	<b>3. Sum</b>	<b>4. Incl Ob</b>	<b>5. Very-Low</b>	<b>6. New</b>	<b>7. Sub.</b>	<b>8. Sum</b>	<b>9. Incl Ob.</b>	<b>10. VLow</b>	<b>11. Sum</b>	<b>12. VLow</b>
	<b>Units</b>	<b>Rehab</b>	<b>#1+#2</b>	<b>#3 x 30%</b>	<b>#4 x 50%</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Rehab.</b>	<b>#6+#7</b>	<b>#8 x 15%</b>	<b>#9x 40%</b>	<b>#4+#9*</b>	<b>#5+#10</b>
PETALUMA CDC						88	20	108	16	6	16	6
SONOMA CDA						105		105	16	6	16	6
<b>County Totals:</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>14</b>
STANISLAUS COUNTY												
NEWMAN RDA		4	4	1	1						1	1
STANISLAUS COUNTY RDA						18		18	3	1	3	1
TURLOCK RDA						79		79	12	5	12	5
<b>County Totals:</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>97</b>		<b>97</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6</b>
SUTTER COUNTY												
YUBA CITY RDA							5	5	1	0	1	0
<b>County Totals:</b>							<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
TULARE COUNTY												
VISALIA CRA						13		13	2	1	2	1
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>13</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
VENTURA COUNTY												
OXNARD RDA	3		3	1	0						1	0
PORT HUENEME RDA						35		35	5	2	5	2
SAN BUENAVENTURA RDA						26		26	4	2	4	2
SIMI VALLEY CDA						44		44	7	3	7	3
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>3</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>105</b>		<b>105</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

05/01/2003

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2001/2002**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 8 of 8**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
<b>Total Agencies Contributing to this Report: 104</b>	<b>1,250</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1,346</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>11,272</b>	<b>859</b>	<b>12,131</b>	<b>1,820</b>	<b>728</b>	<b>2,223</b>	<b>930</b>

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.